

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1 to 31 are pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement and PTO-1449 paper, which were filed on August 19, 2005.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 10-11, 14-17 and 19-31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 to 4, 10 to 11, 14 to 17 and 19 to 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0166834 ("Omar") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0054810 ("Chen"). It is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable over Omar in view of Chen for at least the following reasons.

To reject a claim as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art must disclose or suggest each claim feature, and the prior art must also provide a motivation or suggestion for combining the features in the manner contemplated by the claim. (See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 111 S. Ct. 296 (1990); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990)).

Claim 1 relates to a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement to at least one handheld wireless device that receives data from a wireless carrier network. Claim 1 recites that the system includes a relay arrangement for routing the data for transmission over the wireless carrier network, and a firewall arrangement that provides security for the data, the server arrangement, and the relay arrangement. Claim 1 further recites that the relay arrangement is arranged behind the firewall arrangement.

As admitted on page 3 of the Office Action, the system described by Omar does not include a relay arrangement for routing data for transmission over a wireless carrier network, in which the relay arrangement is arranged behind a firewall arrangement, as recited in claim 1. Rather in Omar, as can be readily seen, for example, in Figure 11, the gateway 15 is arranged outside the security firewall. That is, the gateway 15, which provides an interface between the wireless network 14 and the wide area network (WAN) 16, is arranged outside of the security firewall and therefore unsecured by the firewall. As such, Omar does not disclose, or even suggest, a relay arrangement as recited in claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that Chen likewise does not disclose, or even suggest, a relay arrangement as recited in claim 1. That is, the system described by Chen does not include a relay arrangement for routing data for transmission over a wireless carrier network, in which the relay arrangement is arranged behind a firewall arrangement, as required by claim 1. Indeed, Chen makes no reference to such a relay arrangement, or even to a firewall arrangement.

The Office Action asserts that paragraph [0126] of Chen discloses these features of claim 1. However, paragraph [0126] merely refers to a WAP gateway 502a arranged on a security perimeter of an enterprise network/premise 500, and to a WAP gateway 604 arranged outside the perimeter of the enterprise network/premise 500 within a public carrier network 600. See Figure 19. In this regard, paragraph [0126] states that the WAP gateway 502a arranged on the security perimeter of the enterprise network/premise 500 interacts directly with the WAP gateway 604 of the public carrier network 608 to allow only HTTP traffic from the Carrier WAP gateway 602. Paragraph [0126] does not state, or even suggest, that the WAP gateway 502a arranged within the enterprise network/premise 500 performs a routing function with respect to the public carrier network 608, as required by claim 1. Accordingly, paragraph [0126] does not support disclosure of a relay arrangement, as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action further asserts that it would have been obvious “to modify [the] teachings of Omar with the teachings of Chen because it would allow including an implementation in which the gateway is located on a security perimeter” and because Chen suggests “to shield the enterprise network/premise 500 from outside attacks aimed at the iMobile HTTP/WAP gateway”. However, such assertions are irrelevant because, as explained above, the iMobile HTTP/WAP gateway 502a performs no routing function with respect to the public carrier network 609. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the iMobile HTTP/WAP gateway 502a merely serves as an HTTP access proxy for the Carrier WAP gateway 602. Accordingly, Chen only suggests to shield access to the HTTP server functions and not to the gateway routing functions, which are necessarily resident outside the enterprise network/premise 500 by virtue of the location of the Carrier WAP gateway 602. In this regard, the protection advocated by Chen is focused exclusively on the iMobile HTTP/WAP gateway 502a, which relies on a separate entity outside the enterprise network/premise 500, namely, the Carrier WAP gateway 602 to route the data over public carrier network 608. Indeed, Fig. 19 shows the iMobile HTTP/WAP gateway 502a in a one-to-one relationship with the Carrier WAP gateway 602. Hence, if the Carrier WAP gateway

602 were removed, the system described by Chen would fail to perform the gateway routing functions.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Omar in view of Chen.

Claims 2 to 4, 16, 17, 19 and 22, which ultimately depend from claim 1, and claims 10, 14, 15, 24 and 26, which recite features essentially analogous to claim 1, as well as claims that depend from these claims, including claims 11, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 27 to 31, are patentable over Omar in view of Chen for at least the same reasons given above in support of the patentability of claim 1.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 5 to 9, 12 to 13 and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5 to 9, 12 to 13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Omar, Chen and U.S. Patent No. 2004/0022237 (“Elliot”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Omar, Chen and Elliot does not render unpatentable claims 5 to 9, 12 to 13 and 18 for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5 to 9 and 18 ultimately depend from claim 1 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 1. Claims 12 to 13 depend from claim 10 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 10. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Omar and Chen does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 1 or claim 10. Elliot is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features recited in claim 1 or claim 10 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Omar and Chen. Indeed, Elliot does not disclose, or even suggest, the features recited in claim 1 or claim 10 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Omar and Chen. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Omar, Chen and Elliot does not render unpatentable claims 5 to 9, 12 to 13 or 18.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.


IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/5/05

By:



Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646